



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/780,381

02/17/2004

Bill Tobler

81091393

1819

32997

7590

11/06/2006

TUNG & ASSOCIATES
838 WEST LONG LAKE, SUITE 120
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48302

EXAMINER

CAMBY, RICHARD M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,381

Applicant(s)

TOBLER ET AL.

Examiner

Richard M. Camby

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17-19 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

1. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aoyama (JP06094122).

a. Per claim 1, Aoyama teaches a method of limiting reactive torque transmitted from a set of driven wheels to a powertrain during a sudden braking event including slipping a drive connection between the traction wheels and the powertrain when the sudden braking event commences (see abstract translation). The output shaft 4 of the engine inherently has gears.

b. Per claim 2, Aoyama teaches a predetermined slip rate (M6, figure 1).

c. Per claims 3-6, Aoyama teaches slipping the clutch (see abstract translation).

d. Per claim 7, Aoyama teaches determining whether a sudden braking event occurs (M4) and setting either a first slip level or a second slip level depending on whether there is sudden braking or not (see abstract translation).

Art Unit: 3661

e. Per claim 8, Aoyama teaches that if there is no sudden braking, the slip rate controlling means (M7) is retained in a coupling state or at a predetermined slip rate.

f. Per claim 9, Aoyama teaches a clutch interposed between the wheels and the powertrain (8, figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 10-16, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoyama in view of Matsubara et al. (US005989156A).

Art Unit: 3661

a. Per claim 10, Aoyama teaches a method of limiting reactive torque transmitted from a set of driven wheels to a powertrain during a sudden braking event including slipping a drive connection between the traction wheels and the powertrain when the sudden braking event commences (see abstract translation). Aoyama does not explicitly teach applying the method to a hybrid vehicle. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would know how to apply the method taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle. Matsubara teaches that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious to apply a slip control system to both a conventional internal combustion engine and also electric or hybrid vehicles (column 11, lines 61-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to apply the method taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle, as evidenced by the teaching of Matsubara.

b. Per claims 11, Aoyama teaches slipping the clutch (see abstract translation).

c. Per claim 12, Aoyama teaches a predetermined slip rate (M6, figure 1).

d. Per claim 13, Aoyama teaches transmitting negative torque from the wheels through the driveline to the powertrain during normal driving conditions and limiting the amount of torque transmitted during a sudden braking event (see abstract translation). Aoyama does not explicitly teach applying the method to a hybrid vehicle. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would know how to apply the method taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle. Matsubara teaches that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious to apply a slip

Art Unit: 3661

control system to both a conventional internal combustion engine and also electric or hybrid vehicles (column 11, lines 61-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to apply the method taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle, as evidenced by the teaching of Matsubara.

- e. Per claims 14, Aoyama teaches slipping the clutch (see abstract translation).
- f. Per claim 15, Aoyama teaches a predetermined slip rate (M6, figure 1).
- g. Per claim 16, Aoyama teaches a drive system for a vehicle including a powertrain (figure 2), at least one traction wheel (inherent; not shown in figures) and a driveline (figure 2) including a slip clutch allowing slipping during sudden braking (see abstract translation).
- h. Per claim 20, Aoyama teaches a vehicle drive system including an internal combustion engine (figure 2), at least one traction wheel (inherent; not shown in figures), a driveline (figure 2), a vehicle braking system (inherent), and a control system including a slip clutch controlling the torque transmitted during sudden braking (see abstract translation). Aoyama does not explicitly teach a hybrid vehicle. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would know how to apply the system taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle. Matsubara teaches that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious to apply a slip control system to both a conventional internal combustion engine and also electric or hybrid vehicles (column 11, lines 61-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3661

the art, at the time of invention, to apply the system taught by Aoyama to a hybrid vehicle, as evidenced by the teaching of Matsubara.


i. Per claims 22 and 23, Aoyama teaches determining whether a sudden braking event occurs (M4) and setting either a first slip level or a second slip level depending on whether there is sudden braking or not (see abstract translation).

3. Claims 17-19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten as an independent claim containing all of the limitations of the base claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard M. Camby whose telephone number is (571) 272-6958. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RICHARD M. CAMBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER